ON TRANSMITTAL LETTER

(Large Entity)

Docket No. 2870/220

TO THE ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

Fransmitted herewith	for filing under	35 U.S.C. 111	and 37 C.F.R.	1.53 is the pate	nt application of:
----------------------	------------------	---------------	---------------	------------------	--------------------

John D. Dreher

For: OPTICAL MAKEUP COMPOSITION

Enc	closed are:							
X	Certificate of Mailing with Express Mail Mailing Label No. EL 234414832 U.S.							
	sheets of drawings.							
	A certified copy of a application.							
X	Declaration 🖾 Signed. 🗆 Unsigned.							
Ø	Power of Attorney							
\boxtimes	Information Disclosure Statement							
	Preliminary Amendment							
X	Other: Information Disclosure Statement, PTO 1449 and three references.							

CLAIMS AS FILED								
—	#Filed	#Allowed	#Extra	•	Rate	Fee		
ਹੈ। Tetal Claims	34	- 20 =	14	×	\$18.00	\$252.00		
≒ું Indep. Claims	3	- 3 =	0	×	\$78.00	\$0.00		
s Multiple Dependen	\$0.00							
ä					BASIC FEE	\$690.00		
<u>L</u> W a					TOTAL FILING FEE	\$942.00		
<u> </u>					<u></u>			

A check in the amount of

to cover the filing fee is enclosed.

05-1320 ☑ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge and credit Deposit Account No. as described below. A duplicate copy of this sheet is enclosed.

Charge the amount of

\$942.00

as filing fee.

☑ Credit any overpayment.

☐ Charge the issue fee set in 37 C.F.R. 1.18 at the mailing of the Notice of Allowance,

pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.311(b).

Dated: 1/13/00

Estelle J. Tsevd s, Ph.D., J.D. KENYON & KENYON One Broadway New Y rk, New York 10004

cc:

Attorney Docket No.: 99.49US

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re: Application of Dreher, et al.

Group Art Unit: 1617

Serial No.: 09/482,773

Examiner: YU, Gina C.

Filed: January 13, 2000

For: OPTICAL MAKEUP COMPOSITION

REPLY TO EXAMINER'S RESPONSE TO APPEAL BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents Attention: Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

An Appeal Brief was filed November 26, 2004. A response to the Appeal Brief was mailed June 3, 2005.

In reply to the Examiner's Response, please enter the following remarks.

The Examiner has maintained the rejections of claims 1-7 and 9-11 in view of Kimura ('916) and Hineno ('174), and the rejection of claim 8 in view of the aforementioned references in combination with Hurst. The rejections are again respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has merely engaged in hindsight reconstruction of the claimed invention to establish her case of prima facie obviousness. Nevertheless, it is well-established that "While the test for establishing an implicit teaching, motivation, or suggestion is what the combination of these two statements...would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art, the two statements cannot be viewed in the abstract. Rather, they must be considered in the context of the teaching of the entire reference [emphasis added]. Further, a rejection cannot be

wrinkles and interference pigments. The combination of Hurst with Kimura and Hineno would result in a composition employing a red interference pigment and a luster. The combination of teachings could not lead one skilled in the art to the claimed method for hiding wrinkles.

Thus, in view of the teachings of Hineno, or Hineno and Hurst, one skilled in the art could not reasonably have been led to the conclusion that the method of Kimura of topically applying a composition comprising blue interference pigment to age-wrinkled skin would produce wrinkle hiding effects.

A copy of all claims (1 to 11), pending in this Appeal, also is attached hereto.

Respectfully submitted,

Cynthia R. Miller, Reg. No. 34,678

Greenway Plaza

155 Pinelawn Road, Suite 345 So.

Melville, N.Y. 11747 Tel.: (613) 414-6068 Fax: (631) 531-1340